

## **REMARKS**

**[0001]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, 18-31 and 33-44 are currently pending
- Claims 1, 12, 27, and 43 are amended herein
- New claim 44 is added herein

**[0002]** Support for the amendments to claims 1, 12, 27, and 43 is found in the specification at least at ¶ [0035] – [0036]. Furthermore, new claim 44 is fully supported by the Application, and therefore does not constitute new matter. Support for this new claim is found in the specification at least at ¶ [0036].

## **Cited Documents**

**[0003]** The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Kephart: Kephart et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0042087
- AAPA: Applicant's Admitted Prior Art

### **§ 103 Rejections**

**[0004]** Claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, 18-31, and 33-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Kephart in view of AAPA. Please note claim 17 was previously cancelled. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

#### *Independent Claim 1*

**[0005]** The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 2-3) the following in pertinent part with regard to claim 1:

invoking a first of the plurality of attribute-specific lists via a first object having a first controlling attribute, the first attribute-specific list associated with the first controlling attribute (Figure. 2 and paragraphs [0040-0050]);

selecting an action from the first attribute-specific list to be performed on the first object (paragraphs [0046- 0052]);

invoking a second of the plurality of attribute-specific lists via a second object having a second controlling attribute, the second attribute-specific list associated with the second controlling attribute (Figure. 2, paragraphs [0040-0050] and [0086]- [0088]);

selecting an action from the second attribute-specific list to be performed on the second objection (paragraphs [0046- 0052].

**[0006]** The cited art, and specifically, Kephart, does not describe each and every recital of claim 1 which is copied below (in pertinent part) with emphasis added:

invoking a first of the plurality of attribute-specific lists via a first object having a first controlling attribute, the first attribute-specific list associated with the first controlling attribute;

selecting an action from the first attribute-specific list to be performed on the first object;

reordering the first of the plurality of attribute-specific lists in accordance with the

selected action, the reordering of the first of the plurality of attribute-specific lists performed independently of the remaining attribute-specific lists;

***integrating a general list with the first of the plurality of attribute-specific lists to define an integrated list, the general list having a plurality of entries and further not being associated with the controlling attribute of the first of the plurality of attribute-specific lists, with the integrated list being sorted by a criterion such that the general list is not appended to the first of the plurality of attribute-specific lists;***

[0007] Kephart describes at ¶ [0088]:

[0088] One embodiment of the bookmark assistant operates as follows. When the user desires to create a bookmark for the web page currently being viewed, MailCat\_Classify runs with the web page taken as the message input. ShortcutMode is set to EnhanceMenu, in which case the user views a menu of possible bookmark folders consisting of a set of the to most likely folders prepended to a full alphabetical listing of all bookmark folders. The user selects a folder, and the bookmark is placed in that folder. Classifier updates are handled substantially as described in the description of MailCat, with either instant or lazy learning being supported. However, there are several alterations to the MailCat embodiment that are required to create an automated assistant for organizing bookmarks.

[0008] The cited document of Kephart merely describes "a menu of possible bookmark folders consisting of a set of the [sic] most likely folders prepended to a full alphabetical listing of all bookmark folders." See ¶ [0088]. Kephart has no mention of integrating the most likely folders with the full alphabetical listing, Kephart merely

describes prepending the two. However, claim 1 of the present application recites that the attribute specific list is integrated with a general list defining an integrated list, the general list not being associated with the attribute of the attribute specific list. Further, claim 1 of the present application recites entries of the integrated list are sorted by a criterion other than a source of the entries. Moreover, were Kephart to mention integrating the two folders, Kephart has no mention of sorting the two folders by a criterion other than the source of bookmarks (the folders of the bookmarks).

**[0010]** Furthermore, the remaining cited art does not overcome the deficiencies of Kephart. As shown above, the cited art, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

*Remaining Pending Claims*

**[0011]** In addition to their own merits, dependent claims 3-9 and 11 are allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is allowable. Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 3-9 and 11.

**[0012]** Further, Applicant respectfully contends that the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended, applies with equal weight to independent claims 12, 27, and 43 and the cited art does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of independent claims 12, 27, and 43. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims. Further, in addition to their own merits, dependent claims 13-16, 18-26, 28-31, and 33-42 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend are

allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 13-16, 18-26, 28-31, and 33-42.

*New Dependent Claim 44*

**[0013]** In addition to its own merits, dependent claim 44 is allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is allowable.

**Conclusion**

**[0014]** Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representative for Applicant

/Michael D. Carter 56661/

Dated: /July 7, 2009/

Michael D. Carter (michaelcarter@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162 x5004)  
Registration No. 56661

Reviewer/Supervisor: Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162x5005)  
Registration No. 53725